

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 7	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 10-Mar-98		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE NO. N/A	
5. PROJECT NO. (IF APPLICABLE)					
6. ISSUED BY: SUPPLY DEPARTMENT INDIAN HEAD DIV, NAVSURFWARREN 101 STRAUSS AVENUE INDIAN HEAD MD 20640-5035 BUYER/SYMBOL: EDNA A. GIGON, CODE 1142K (301)743-6682		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP CODE)		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00174-98-R-0019			
		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 13-Feb-98 (13 JAN 98 IS INCORRECT)			
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.			
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)			
CODE		FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> THE ABOVE NUMBERED SOLICITATION IS AMENDED AS SET FORTH IN ITEM 14. THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IS EXTENDED <input type="checkbox"/> IS NOT EXTENDED.					
OFFER'S MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS AMENDMENT PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED IN THE SOLICITATION OR AS AMENDED, BY ONE OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS: (a) BY COMPLETING ITEMS 8 AND 15, AND RETURNING <u>2</u> COPIES OF THE AMENDMENT: (b) BY ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF THIS AMENDMENT ON EACH COPY OF THE OFFER SUBMITTED; OR (c) BY SEPARATE LETTER OR TELEGRAM WHICH INCLUDES A REFERENCE TO THE SOLICITATION AND AMENDMENT NUMB FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. IF BY VIRTUE OF THIS AMENDMENT YOU DESIRE TO CHANGE AN OFFER ALREADY SUBMITTED, SUCH CHANGE MAY BE MADE BY TELEGRAM OR LETTER, PROVIDED EACH TELEGRAM OR LETTER MAKES REFERENCE TO THE SOLICITATION AND THIS AMENDMENT, AND IS RECEIVED PRIOR TO THE OPENING HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED.					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DAT. (if required) ACR: N/A					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (SUCH AS CHANGES IN PAYING OFFICE, APPROPRIATION DATE, ETC.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).					
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor () is not, (X) is required to sign this document and return 002 copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible).					
<p>ALL OFFERORS ARE REQUIRED TO RETURN TWO SIGNED COPIES OF THIS AMENDMENT WITH THEIR OFFERS.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHED PAGES FOR ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS AND AN EXTENSION TO THE PROPOSAL DUE DATE FOR SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019 .</p> <p>THE DUE DATE FOR SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019 IS HEREBY EXTENDED TO 23 MARCH 1998 AT 1 P.M.</p>					
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED HEREIN, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE DOCUMENT REFERENCED IN ITEM 9A OR 10A, AS HERETOFORE CHANGED, REMAINS UNCHANGED AND IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.					
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY: _____		16C. DATE SIGNED	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		(Signature of Contracting Officer)			

AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019

1. The closing date for solicitation N00174-98-R-0019 is hereby extended to 1 p.m. local time on 23 March 1998. Submission after this date and time will not be accepted in accordance with FAR 52.215-1 "Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisitions (Oct 1997)" regarding late offers.

2. The following answers are provided to questions received within the time frame allotted for questions by the solicitation:

Q1. The scope of the solicitation is broad and non-specific (Page 7; paragraph 1-2); as is the nature of these types of contracts. Therefore, allowances for cost estimates relating to specific test equipment required depends on the scope of the task orders yet to be defined. Paragraph H.6 on page 27 is therefore vague. Is it the governments intention to provide all reasonable elements required for the accomplishment of the task?

A1. Unless otherwise provided in the delivery order, the contractor is expected to have all required facilities/equipment to accomplish delivery order tasks under this contract. Clause H.6 - Government-Furnished Property, is included to provide for those unique situations which require the use of Government Property.

Q2. Paragraph 52.215-6 on page 46 requires the bidder to specify all the facilities. Does the government then desire to specify qualifications on the location of the facilities? If so, what are the criterion used? Can government facilities currently used to evaluate weapon systems be used in this contract?

A2. There is not a facilities criterion specific to this contract. We do need to know that the contractor has facilities that could, if needed, support tasks under the resulting contract. An offeror should not plan to use Government facilities. Offerors can state what support they provide utilizing government facilities under prior contracts, however, it should be assumed that those facilities would not be available for use on this contract.

AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019

Q3. Page 4, Section B, Note: prescribes other direct costs in the amount of \$100,000 for travel and \$50,000 for material for each year. Are offerors to provide detailed cost data supporting each of these line item amounts? Are these figures not-to-exceed amounts, i.e., inclusive of applicable burden(s)?

A3. Offerors are not required to provide cost data supporting the estimates provided by the Government. Burdens, if any, applied by the contractor to these estimates must be explicitly stated and supported.

Q4. Pages 52 and 63, items L.10 and M.4, direct offerors to identify where they are substituting previous approved Single Process Initiatives (SPIs) for specified requirements. We are unfamiliar with SPIs.

A4. These clauses are only applicable to contractors with approved Single Process Initiatives. Your evaluation will not be affected if SPIs do not apply.

Q5. Offerors are repeatedly warned that taking exception to any term or condition of the RFP may render that proposal unacceptable. However, page 53, item L.11, Note: states that cover letters, which are only necessary when taking exceptions, are included in page limitations. Uncertain of the Government's receptivity to posed exceptions, it behooves us to address exceptions through clarifications. Page 35, item I.59 incorporates FAR 52.232-9, "Limitation on Withholding of Payments." In alignment with DFAR 252.232-7004, "DoD Progress Payment Rates," Coalescent requests consideration to substitute a progress payment and liquidation rate of 95 percent for small disadvantaged business concerns vice the progress payment and liquidation rate of 85 percent associated with large business.

A5. DFAR 252.232-7004 is not incorporated into the solicitation (used in fixed price contracts under which the Government will provide progress payments based on costs). This solicitation will result in a cost plus fixed fee type contract. FAR 52.232-9 requires no clarification.

Q6. Is there a page limitation for the Corporate Experience Matrix, Parts 1 and 2, which is included in Volume II?

A6. No.

AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019

Q7. Is there a page limitation for the Corporate Resource Matrix (Attachment 3) which is included in Volume II?

A7. No.

Q8. Page 55, item B.2, Key Personnel, states that offerors are to provide a minimum of one and a maximum of two resumes for each position. For those key labor categories which have estimated yearly hours exceeding one man year, such as the Senior Math Modeler (3,792 hours), are two resumes required to be responsive and compliant? Will the number of resumes offered for these categories affect the proposal scoring? Must we offer two properly qualified resumes to attain the highest possible score?

A8. The min and max requirement is the same regardless of the hours, one resume will make a bidder compliant. The number of resumes is not as important as the resumes themselves. Each resume will be evaluated separately, if a bidder offers two resumes and one is excellent and one is good, they both will be taken into consideration when determining the overall score. If you offer two resumes that carry a high rating then two resumes would give you the possibility of a higher score, however, if you offer two resumes and one does not score high, it may drop your overall rating. The limitations of the resumes were meant to give bidders the flexibility to offer the best overall resources for the tasks.

Q9. In the Personnel Resource Matrix, regarding the last six columns which reflect Statement of Work areas, are these columns to be filled in with years of experience for each column, or simply marked with an "x" to show experience in that specific area.

A9. Simply mark with an "x."

3. The following is a list of contractors and their internet addresses who have shown interest in this solicitation:

1. Advanced Systems Technology, Inc.
astcorp@astcorp.com
2. Noesis Inc.
ASullivan@Noesis-Inc.com

AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019

3. Bob Sylvain
sylvainr@ctcorp.com
4. CNJ WEST
CNJ_WEST@classic.msn.com
5. Dschul5620aol.com
Dschul5620@aol.com
6. DTarquiniaol.com
Dtarquini@aol.com
7. Frank Bessenyei
Fbessenye@osfl.gmu.edu
8. George Stathopoulos
atrhost!gstath@uunet.uu.net
9. GIOJOHNaol.com
GIOJOHN@aol.com
10. HisEvaine
AOL(<http://www.aol.com>)
HisEvaine@aol.com
11. **Joyce** Finney
Finney_J@ENDMARK.COM
12. **Joanne** Branin
JoanneB@EPSCORP.com
13. **John** Granata
johng@servicescorp.com
14. KCAIIncaol.com
KCAIInc@aol.com
15. Marv Elliott
trantech., inc.
marv_elliott@trantech-inc.com
16. Monty Benenhaley
mbenenhaley@tcsdesign.com

AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019

17. **MSSI WASH**
AOL(<http://www.aol.com>)
MSSIWASH@aol.com
18. PICSD
AOL(<http://www.aol.com>)
PICSD@aol.com
19. setterpop.erols.com
setter@pop.erols.com
20. sspowell
Strategic Technologies, Inc.
sspowell@flash.net
21. PCA
Tackettpca@aol.com
22. Comprehensive Technologies Inc.
Bill_McCeney@cti.com
23. Columbia Research Corporation
COLRESCORP@EROLS.COM
24. National Technologies Associates, Inc.
RSMITH@eagle1.eaglenet.com
25. VSE Corporation
Wilson_Gregory@VSECORP.com
26. SAA International, LTD.
sadelman@ssa-intl.com
27. telestar Corp.
Telestarcorp@worldnet.att.net
28. General Scientific Corporation
shea@mailgsc.genscicorp.com
29. Epoch Engineering, Inc.
NYAH@EROLS.COM
30. Vector Research Inc.
ellisf@vrinet.com

AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N00174-98-R-0019

31. VTEC Laboratories Inc.
71072.2246@compuserve.com
32. SDS International
ggennin@sdslink.com
33. PRC
cottoms_robert@prc.com